THE

UNITARIAN.

No. 3. MARCH, 1846. VOL. I.

UNITARIANISM *versus* TRINITARIANISM.

To those who have investigated the grounds on which Unitarianism rests, and are already convinced of the truth and excellence of its doctrines, it cannot be supposed that the present essay will offer much, if anything, that is new: but we must beg such of our readers as come under this description, to remember that we do not write for them alone; that one main object of this periodical is, to spread a knowledge of the principles of Unitarian belief among inquiring spirits out of the pale of the denomination. With this end in view, in the present paper, we trust we shall be excused by our co-religionists if we repeat arguments and quotations with which they are already familiar, while we endeavour to set forth in as concise a manner as the subject will admit, what we consider to be errors and fallacies in the Trinitarian scheme, as well as the grounds of our preference of the Unitarian faith.

As Trinitarians differ somewhat among themselves, we begin by a short statement of these differences. The commonly-received, or orthodox opinion is, that the Supreme Being consists of three persons, to each of whom belong the essential attributes of Deity; and that these three persons constitute only one God. Of the advocates of this notion, some consider that the term Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are merely relative—that the persons in the Trinity did not exist under these characters from all eternity; that there is no precedence amongst them, either in time, order, or dignity. Others believe that the Father, designated as the first person in the Godhead, is alone the source or fountain of Deity; that the Son, who is the second person, was begotten of the Father; and that the Holy Ghost, the third person,

proceeded from the Father and the Son: and yet that these three persons are co-equal, co-essential, and co-eternal. For proof of this, let the reader consult the Creed of St. Athanasius, the Articles of the Church of England, the Confession of Faith, and the writings of many Church of England Divines. These, then, who hold this view, may be denominated Athanasian Trinitarians. Some, again, have been of opinion, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are not three persons, but three modes, characters, or relations; and that only one person is uniformly meant by the sacred writers, when treating of the Father, the Son, or the Spirit. Among those who have entertained this notion, and who come under the appellation of Sabellians, may be mentioned the names of Doctors Wallis and South. "A Divine Person," says the former, in his *Considerations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, "is only a mode, or respect, or relation of God to his creatures. He beareth to his creatures these three relations, modes, or respects, that He is their Creator, their Redeemer, and their Sanctifier. This is what we mean, and all we mean, when we say God is three persons." On the other hand, some have employed language concerning the three persons in the Godhead, unequivocally expressing the notion of three distinct Gods. These may be termed Tritheistic Trinitarians. The following is the language of the celebrated Dr. Sherlock: "It is plain the persons are perfectly distinct, for they are three distinct and infinite minds, and therefore three distinct persons; for a person is an intelligent being, and to say they are three Divine persons, and not three distinct infinite minds, is both heresy and nonsense: the Scripture, I'm sure, represents Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as three intelligent Beings, not as three Powers or Faculties of the same Being, which is downright Sabellianism; for Faculties are not persons, no more than memory, will, and understanding, are three persons in one man: when we prove the Holy Ghost to be a person, against the Socinians, who make Him only a Divine Power, we prove that all the properties of a person belong to Him, such as understanding, will, affections, and actions; which shows what our notion of a person is, such a Being as has understanding, and will, and power of action; and it would be very

strange, that *we should own three persons, each of which persons is truly and properly God and not own infinite minds;* as if anything could be a God but an infinite mind."

The precise import of the term *person,* as used by Trinitarians, it is difficult, indeed, to ascertain; some of them defining it one way, some another. On this point, however, the more modern advocates of the Trinity are comparatively silent; making use of the word *person* without professing to employ it as the representative of any definite idea.

Having thus pointed out the discrepancies which exist in the notion entertained of the Trinity by one class of Christians, it may not be amiss for the right understanding of the subject to refer to the distinctions which also prevail in Unitarianism. And first, as regards those Unitarian Christians denominated *Arians:* these profess to believe that God is one person only; that His Son Jesus Christ is distinct from and inferior to him; and that the Holy Spirit is merely an attribute or gift of God. With respect to Christ, some hold that as a subordinate Deity, but superior to all other intelligences, he created the Universe, and supports and governs it: others, that he was a super-angelic being, employed by the Almighty in forming the solar system, or in reducing our globe to its present habitable form. Among the eminent advocates of these views, we may mention the names of Milton, and Dr. Price. Others deny that the Son had any concern in the formation of any world, but affirm that he was a pre-existent spirit. All Arians, however, concur in opinion that he came down from Heaven, assumed our human nature, and lived and died as a man, to accomplish the important ends for which he was sent into the world. *Socinians,* so called from being the followers of Socinus, a Polish reformer, while they admitted the strict unity of God, and the simple humanity of Christ, held that the latter was entitled to religious homage, on account of his exaltation to the right hand of the Father. *Unitarians Proper,* sometimes styled *Humanitarians,* believe that God is one, in the strict sense of the word, and, unlike the *Socinians,* hold *that he alone is entitled to religious worship;* and that His Son Jesus Christ, was only a human being, but superior to all other divinely-com-

missioned Teachers, inasmuch as his mission was of a much higher character. The Holy Spirit is considered by both sects to signify either the Father himself, or His power, wisdom, inspiration, &c.

Now, it will be obvious, from the distinction above indicated, that to class Unitarians with Socinians—that is, with those who pay divine homage to the Saviour—seems to argue either great ignorance of the respective tenets of the two sects, or a determination to misapply a name, which is well known to be universally disclaimed by the "true worshippers of the Father." The designation *Unitarian* may, however, be very properly employed to signify all who maintain God to be one person only, including Arians, Socinians, and Humanitarians. "Unitarian," says Mr. Aspland, "is not opposed to Tritheist or Polytheist; it does not denote a believer in one God as contradistinguished from a believer in three Gods, or more Gods than one: it is opposed to Trinitarian—*Tri-Unitarian*—only, and signifies a believer in, and a worshipper of one God in one person, as contradistinguished from a believer in, and a worshipper of one God in three persons. * * * Unitarians believe, that the 'Lord their God is one Lord,' and that the possession and observance of this great truth is 'the first of all the commandments.'"—(Mark xii. 29.)

The maintenance of this doctrine of God's unity is regarded by those who are convinced of its reasonableness and truth, as of the utmost importance, not only, because, like all other truths, it is important in itself, but because its results, they conceive, are of vast moment to the moral as well as religious welfare of man both here and hereafter.

Unitarians are astonished that any one can read the New Testament, and avoid being convinced that the Father alone is God; especially too, when our Saviour himself was continually appropriating this character to Him. "God sent his Son," "God anointed Jesus," &c. If this title belongs equally to Jesus, much of the phraseology of the New Testament is perfectly inexplicable. Indeed, they may well challenge their opponents to adduce a single passage in that book, where the word *God* means three persons, and where, unless turned from its usual sense by the connexion, it does not mean the Father.

To some of the passages generally adduced to support the Trinitarian hypothesis, we shall have occasion to allude in a subsequent part of this essay.

But there is one difficulty with regard to the Trinity, that has always appeared to us insurmountable, and, considered *à priori*, would seem almost to be decisive of the question. No one, we conceive, has put it so well and so concisely as Dr. Channing, and we shall therefore avail ourselves of the passage from his works. "Christianity," says he, "was planted and grew up amidst sharp-sighted enemies, who overlooked no objectionable part of the system, and who must have fastened with great earnestness on a doctrine involving such apparent contradictions as the Trinity. We cannot conceive an opinion, against which the Jews, who prided themselves on an adherence to God's unity, would have raised an equal clamour. Now, how happens it, that in the Apostolic writings, which relate so much to objections against Christianity, and to the controversies which grew out of this religion, not one word is said, implying that objections were brought against the Gospel from the doctrine of the Trinity—not one word is uttered in its defence and explanation—not a word to rescue it from reproach and mistake? This argument has almost the force of demonstration. We are persuaded that had three divine persons been announced by the first preachers of Christianity, all equal, and all infinite, one of whom was the very Jesus who had lately died on a cross, this peculiarity of Christianity would have almost absorbed every other, and the great labour of the Apostles would have been to repel the continual assaults which it would have awakened. But the fact is, that not a whisper of objection to Christianity, on that account, reaches our ears from the Apostolic age. In the Epistles we see not a trace of controversy called forth by the Trinity."

There are many other weighty objections to this doctrine, of a practical character, which have been very ably stated by various Unitarian writers. We shall briefly advert to some of these, and then pass on to the theological points involved in the discussion. The tenet of a Trinity is regarded by Unitarians as unfavourable to devotion, by dividing and distracting the mind in its communion with God. It injures devotion, in fact, not only

by uniting with the Father other objects of worship, but by taking from Him the supreme affection which is His due, and transferring it to the Son. The investing of Christ with all the attributes of Divinity, naturally renders him the most interesting and attractive person in the Godhead, because he has been clothed in our form, has felt our wants and sorrows ; and hence the unreflecting mind is apt to turn in devotional homage to him, rather than to "his God and our God," the Father in Heaven, who is a pure and invisible spirit. Is there not something of idolatry in this? May it not be thought to originate in the same feeling—to flow from the same source as that which gives to the Virgin Mary so conspicuous a place in the devotions of the Roman Catholic Church ?

Unitarians entertain a warm faith in the moral perfections of God. All Christians, indeed, profess to acknowledge in the Divine character the qualities of goodness, justice, and holiness ; but when they come to apply these qualities to Him in particular instances, there is not seldom a want of correspondence between such applications and the general idea of those Heavenly attributes. It would seem that, in the view of some, the Supreme Being is raised above the principles of morality, above those eternal laws of equity and rectitude, to which all other beings are subjected. Unitarians conceive that in no being is the sense of right so strong, so omnipotent, as in God. "We believe," says Channing, "that His almighty power is entirely submitted to His perceptions of rectitude ; and this is the ground of our piety. It is not because He is our creator merely, but because He created us for good and holy purposes ; it is not because His will is irresistible, but because His will is the perfection of virtue, that we pay Him allegiance. We cannot bow before a being, however great and powerful, who governs tyranically. We respect nothing but excellence, whether on Earth or in Heaven. We venerate not the loftiness of God's throne, but the equity and goodness in which it is established."

We will not here dwell on those God-dishonouring systems which teach the total depravity of man, or the no less fearful doctrines of Election and Reprobation ; they would demand too much of our space, and our object in these preliminary observations is not so much controversy as statement and exposition.

It may seem singular to those who are in the habit of decrying Unitarianism without knowing what it really is, that its professors do not take their stand so much on the theological truth of its doctrines as on the consideration that it is peculiarly adapted to promote inward, living, practical religion. This latter they consider to be its especial character and property—that it has a tendency, superior to that of the popular system, to form an elevated religious character. What is the chief purpose, or what, to an unbiased mind, might be supposed to appear the main object of Christianity? Would it not be to generate and extend piety, to assimilate our souls to the Divine mind? Whatever religious system, therefore, shall be found to fulfil these objects, will surely be worthy of profound attention, as possessing authentic tokens of a Divine original. But let it be remembered that the characteristics of a truly religious nature are not fanatical ravings, gloomy apprehensions, or superstitious forms, but a filial love and reverence towards God, a cheerful reliance on His goodness and mercy, an habitual gratitude and ready obedience, and an earnest aspiring after the Divine perfections.

Now, the simpler a system of religious truths is, the better adapted it would appear to be as a means to attain these ends; and Unitarianism must be allowed to be characterised by greater simplicity than Trinitarianism. It presents to the mind One, and one only, infinite person as the object of supreme homage, whereas the latter presents Three. By this it concentrates, as it were, the energy of the religious sentiment, while the other principle divides and scatters it among various objects. The piety of the soul thus distracted, is divested of much of its efficacy and intensity. The more strict and absolute the unity of the object of religious worship, the more easily and intimately the pious impressions and emotions of the soul blend and unite into one harmonious all-absorbing affection. This *primâ facie* view of the superior tendency of Unitarianism over its opposite, to promote the truly religious sentiment, has, we are aware, been frequently descanted on by many able writers, and in more eloquent phrase than we can employ, but we are sure our readers will excuse our reiteration of so vitally important a principle in the doctrine, the moral features

of which we are endeavouring, though it be but in a condensed form, to expose and elucidate.

This doctrine inculcates, in an especial manner, the spirituality of the Divine Being. "God is a spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." Next to what we have already adverted to, if there be any one principle in Christianity more peculiarly worthy of our attention and reverence, it is this, because it tends to refine and elevate our conceptions of God. And, surely, if the Jewish people were justly enjoined to refrain from representing God under any bodily form, it will be allowed to be much more incumbent upon Christians to be on their guard in this respect. Now, the pre-eminent tendency of that view of the Christian religion which we are anxious to enforce is, to spiritualize the object of supreme homage. Whereas, it would seem to us, that it is the direct influence of the orthodox system to materialise men's conceptions of God. Hear the pious Doctor Channing on this point: "the leading feature of Trinitarianism is, the doctrine of a God clothed with a body, and acting and speaking through a material frame, of the Infinite Divinity dying on a cross; a doctrine, which in earthliness reminds us of the mythology of the rudest pagans, and which a pious Jew, in the twilight of the Mosaic religion would have shrunk from with horror. It seems to me no small objection to the Trinity, that it supposes God to take a body in the later and more improved ages of the world, when it is plain, that such a manifestation, if needed at all, was peculiarly required in the infancy of the race. The effect of such a system in debasing the idea of God, in associating with the Divinity human passions and infirmities, is too obvious to need much elucidation. * * The Roman Catholics, true to human nature and their creed, have sought, by painting and statuary, to bring their imagined God before their eyes; and have thus obtained almost as vivid impressions of Him as if they had lived with Him on the earth. The Protestant condemns them for using these similitudes and representations in their worship; *but, if a Trinitarian, he does so to his own condemnation. For if, as he believes, it was once a duty to bow in adoration before the living body of his incarnate God, what possible guilt can there be in worshipping before the pictured or sculptured*

memorial of the same being? Christ's body may as truly be represented by the artist as any other human form; and its image may be used as effectually and properly as that of an ancient sage or hero, to recal Him with vividness to the mind. Is it said that God has expressly forbidden the use of images in our worship? But why was that prohibition laid on the Jews? For this express reason, that God had not presented Himself to them in any form which admitted of representation. Hear the language of Moses: 'Take good heed lest ye make you a graven image, for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire.' (Deut. IV., 15, 16). If, since that period, God has taken a body, then the reason of the prohibition has ceased; and if He took a body, among other purposes, that he might assist the weakness of the intellect, which needs a material form, then a statue, which lends so great an aid to the conception of an absent friend, is not only justified, but seems to be required."

We need hardly dwell longer on the effect which the idea of a threefold Divinity has to detract from the purely spiritual nature of God, and hence to debase and perplex in the same degree the devotion of His worshippers. We proceed, therefore, to treat upon the accordance of Unitarianism, with just views of the physical and moral world. It has already been beautifully remarked that the outward universe—the natural creation—bears testimony to the existence, the power, and love, of one almighty, intelligent Being. The researches of philosophy, too, have contributed to strengthen and multiply the proofs of the Divine unity. No evidence is adduced by the one or the other of Three Divine Persons. There is no Trinitarianism in nature or philosophy. Neither the heavens nor the earth, nor the investigations into their physical phenomena, proclaim the presence of a tri-personal author. This, then, is surely ground sufficient to justify the Unitarian in maintaining that nature itself concurs with his exposition of one of the essential principles of revelation—namely, the Divine unity. And this concurrence tends to strengthen and increase the impression derived from both. The truths of revelation are never so gladly and intimately cherished, as when they fall in with the truths deduced from the inquiries instituted into, or reflections on, the works of creation.

By the convictions thus obtained, the mind becomes still further opened and enlarged. We rest not satisfied with one source of information and instruction, but delight to seek in its counterpart a confirmation of its precepts. We do not feel ourselves confined to the written record, but go forth in freedom and confidence to read the volume of the universe spread out before us. This is no mean advantage. The mind thus becomes enriched and fertilised; new views and new lights open to it; and hence a salutary growth in religious knowledge and feeling is experienced. What is the tendency, in this respect, of the orthodox system? Is it not to shut up the mind in what is written, to damp its inquiries in the book of nature, and thus circumscribe, within comparatively narrow limits, its sphere of vision? It must, doubtless, be admitted that this condition naturally flows from its peculiar teachings. It, in fact, excludes from the mind those improving aids afforded by contemplations on the outward universe, of which we have been speaking. It concentrates its attention, as it were, upon one object—one source of instruction. And even the religious impressions hence derived, being for the most part of a gloomy and desponding cast, naturally impart a dark and sombre aspect to those views of nature and society which the understanding is induced to take in moments, it may be, of involuntary reflection. "It is then tempted," observes Channing, "to aggravate the miseries of life, and to see in them only the marks of Divine displeasure and punishing justice; and overlooks their obvious fitness and design to awaken our powers, exercise our virtues, and strengthen our social ties. In like manner, it exaggerates the sins of men, that the need of an Infinite atonement may be maintained. Some of the most affecting tokens of God's love within and around us are obscured by this gloomy theology. The glorious faculties of the soul, its high aspirations, its sensibility to the great and good in character, its sympathy with disinterested and suffering virtue, its benevolent and religious instincts, its thirst for a happiness not found on earth—these are overlooked or thrown into the shade, that they may not disturb the persuasion of man's natural corruption. Ingenuity is employed to disparage what is interesting in the human character. Whilst the bursts of passion in

the new-born child are gravely urged as indications of a native rooted corruption, its bursts of affection, its sweet smile, its innocent and irrepressible joy, its loveliness and beauty, are not listened to, though they plead more eloquently its alliance with higher natures. The sacred and tender affections of home; the unwearied watchings and cheerful sacrifices of parents; the reverential, grateful assiduity of children, smoothing an aged father's or mother's descent to the grave; woman's love, stronger than death; the friendship of brothers and sisters; the anxious affection which tends around the bed of sickness; the subdued voice, which breathes comfort into the mourner's heart; all the endearing offices, which shed a serene light through our dwellings; these are explained away by the thorough advocates of this system, so as to include no real virtue, so as to consist with a natural aversion to goodness. Even the higher efforts of disinterested benevolence, and the most unaffected expressions of piety, if not connected with what is called 'the true faith,' are, by the most rigid disciples of the doctrine which I oppose, resolved into the passion for distinction, or some other working of 'unsanctified nature.' Thus, Trinitarianism and its kindred doctrines have a tendency to veil God's goodness, to sully His fairest works, to dim the lustre of those innocent and pure affections which a Divine breath kindles in the soul, to blight the beauty and freshness of creation, and in this way to consume the very nutriment of piety. We know, and rejoice to know, that in multitudes this tendency is counteracted by a cheerful temperament, a benevolent nature, and a strength of gratitude, which bursts the shackles of a melancholy system. But from the nature of the doctrine, the tendency exists and is strong; and an impartial observer will often discern it resulting in gloomy, depressing views of life and the universe."

Without doubt, the Trinitarian system does not properly suit (for it is far behind) the present state of knowledge and general enlightenment. It is a barren, technical, and artificial system—without warmth, without vitality. It is the product of the dark, unrefined ages, foreign in its spirit to the intellect and feeling of enlightened and progressive minds. "With few exceptions," pursues the excellent author above quoted, "the Trinitarian theology

of the present day is greatly deficient in freshness of thought, and in power to awaken the interest, and to meet the intellectual and spiritual wants of thinking men. I see, indeed, superior minds and great minds among the adherents of the prevalent system; but they seem to me to move in chains, and to fulfil poorly their high function of adding to the wealth of the human intellect. Now, a system which has a tendency to confine the mind, and to impair its sensibility to the manifestations of God in the universe, is so far unfriendly to piety, to a bright, joyous, hopeful, ever-growing love of the Creator. It tends to generate and nourish a religion of a melancholy tone; such, I apprehend, as now predominates in the Christian world."

On the other hand, Unitarianism, from its accordance with reason and the nature of things, is conducive to that sentiment of the heart and mind, which is denominated piety. There is no inconsistency in its doctrines. Its creed does not inculcate one thing, and the moral feelings another. Hence it enjoys a pleasing harmoniousness with 'the great and clear principles of revelation; with the laws and powers of human nature; with the dictates of the moral sense; with the noblest instincts and highest aspirations of the soul; and with the lights which the universe throws on the character of its author.' In this there is no self-contradiction, all is agreement and harmony; no violence is done to the rational and instinctive faculties; the conscience and the reason coincide. A religion of this character is capable of infinite benefit; it tends to raise the whole spiritual being, to exalt and purify its affections, and to give it an earnest of the consummation of the Divine precept—"Be ye perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect."

We will not pursue this topic further. We think we have said enough to give to the calm, reflecting, and candid inquirer some useful and available suggestions as to the comparative merits and tendencies of the two systems in a moral, and intellectual, as well as religious point of view. It is not unlikely, it is true, that such inquirer may be disposed to ask in reply for further information on the theological bearing of the question, and as to how we explain several passages of Scriptures which, to him, may appear to prove, if not precisely the doctrine

of the Trinity, yet some kindred tenets which Trinitarians hold, but which Unitarians reject. To this part of our subject we intend to apply ourselves in a future number, and shall conclude the present article with a few remarks not irrelevant to that design.

It is very important that every investigator of the grounds of his religious opinions, should come to the task with a dispassionate, candid, and reasoning mind, in order that he may be the better prepared to weigh well the evidences of those doctrines which the Scriptures are admitted to contain and inculcate. Let such inquirer, in the first instance, bear well in his mind the advice of Lord Bacon, which we have chosen for our motto:—"Read—not to contradict or refute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse; but weigh and consider." As it is to be supposed that every one capable of such an examination has been educated in some religious profession, it would be well for him to ask himself, "Have I received my religious opinions from the Bible, or have I imbibed them from education, and, without examination, adopted the systems of fallible men? Am I an accountable being—a moral agent? Is it to God, the Great Searcher of hearts and Judge of all, that I must give an account? Then, what is man that I should be influenced by his authority, and neglect the solemn commands of God?"*

It will not, indeed, be disputed, we think, by any rational person, that there is a variety of opinions and practices prevalent in the religious world, justly claiming no other foundation than human authority. And an assiduous reader of ecclesiastical history will soon be convinced of the inadequacy of such foundation only to support a theological fallacy beyond the period of its doom. How many such errors have sprung up, obtained notoriety and adoption for a time, and at length been exploded beyond the possibility of recal! If the doctrine of the Trinity still maintains its ground among professing

* This inquiry might be somewhat stimulated by the perusal of a small tract on this subject, entitled, "An Answer to the Question—Is the Doctrine of the Trinity contained in the Bible, or is it of Human Invention?" We recommend this little treatise to the notice of Tract Societies for distribution: it can be obtained from our Publisher.

Christians as a doctrine of the Scriptures, be it recollected that its propagation and maintenance have been effected by the stringency of human laws; by the infliction of pains, and penalties, and even death, by the various governments of Europe, on those who have brought its truth or importance, as a part of the Christian system, into question. A spirit, kindred to that which enacted those sanguinary edicts, still exists, though their execution is, in a great measure, stayed by the countervailing spirit of a general civilisation. Yet other influences prevail to keep down inquiry, and prolong the continuance of a doctrine, as an article of religious belief, which must eventually, we think, give way before the increase of knowledge and refinement, and the researches of a just and deep and enlightened criticism.

We are told by those who have taken the trouble to calculate, and thus ascertain the fact, that the Unity of God is either positively asserted or plainly implied, in about two thousand passages in the Old Testament, and in a thousand of the New Testament; and in all the Bible there is but one text which contains anything like a formal statement of the doctrine of the Trinity (I. John, v. 7), generally termed the text of "the Three Heavenly Witnesses;" and that text, which was some time ago esteemed the bulwark of this mysterious notion, is now given up as spurious,—nay, it was even demolished by Trinitarians themselves. In the present day, were persons of any religious denomination to contend for its genuineness, they would only expose themselves to the charge of fatuity or ignorance. Several learned Roman Catholic writers; the celebrated Michaelis, a German writer of great critical abilities, and a Trinitarian; his English Translator, Dr. Marsh, Bishop of Peterborough, and many Dissenters of different denominations, none of whom have ever given to the world occasion to suspect their belief in the popular creed, have unreservedly admitted the spuriousness of this text. Moreover, we should think that no divine, having any regard for his own credit, will henceforth venture to support its genuineness against the irrefragable arguments of Professor Porson in his "Letters to Archdeacon Travis," wherein he proves beyond the possibility of cavil, that the text in question is a forgery and an interpolation. Indeed, it is not to be found,

as it now stands, in any Greek MS. before the 15th century, nor in any Latin MS. earlier than the 9th century. It was omitted by Luther in his translation of the Bible into German.* In the translations published in the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth, it was printed in a different character, or included in brackets, thus [ ]. Between the years 1560 and 1580, it began to be printed as we now have it in our bibles, but by whose authority it is not known.

The other passages supposed to imply, if not to state, a Trinity in the Godhead, we intend to treat of in our next number.

BLASPHEMY.

CHRISTIANITY, as professed by Unitarians, is *not* blasphemy. There is not, in the whole of the orthodox vocabulary, a more undefined term. It is an expression of reproach used by bigots.

It is applied to him who dares to question the divine right of a *pretended* Christian priesthood, or the divine right of tithes to maintain such a priesthood. To assert that the doctrines of the Athanasian Creed are not only false but contrary to the teaching of the Scriptures, is by many held to be Blasphemy. To deny the doctrine of the divine nature of our Lord and Master, who was, as Moses foretold, made in *all* respects like to his brethren, is, with the advocate of a Triune God, Blasphemy. Thus it is, also, to call in question the deity of Jesus of Nazareth, who was meek and lowly of heart, and left us an example that *we* should follow in his steps, and the incarceration of Deity in a humanly and created being. To deny the death of God—the exhibition of the fountain of life—the Creator of all things visible and invisible—on the cross, suffering in body and mind all the torments of the sinful and damned, and, according to the opinion of a pious and celebrated author, more than an eternity of such torments,

* A popular summary of the arguments employed by the Professor in these letters, would, we think, be of considerable service.—ED.

is sufficient to brand a man as an infidel and a blasphemer: and, to sum up all in one word in which is concentrated all that is or can be possibly conceived of evil personified—a Unitarian. That the unthinking and unlettered of the orthodox school should denounce the doctrines professed by Christian Unitarians as blasphemous, is by no means surprising, since they do as they are taught; on them we can *cast* the smile of pity, but that of contempt belongs to their teachers, who arrogantly style themselves their superiors; but when men whose education has been costly, and who pride themselves with academic and cathedric honours, display gross ignorance of the real interpretation of the term, united with the absence of Christian charity, which hopeth all things, forgiveth all things, it is difficult to designate their conduct with an appropriate epithet. Surely, when reverend divines retire from their pulpits, from which they have been denouncing their fellow Christians as God-denying apostates and blasphemers, and retire to their closets and commune with their God—surely conscience must force the crimson to their cheeks, unless they are insensible to the convictions of conscience. An excellent and learned theologian,* who was not a Unitarian, in reference to the subject under consideration, remarks—

"No errors concerning the Divine perfections can be grosser than those of Polytheists or Idolators such as the ancient Pagans. Yet those errors are never in holy writ brought under the denomination of Blasphemy; nor are those who maintain them ever styled blasphemers. Among those who are no idolators, but acknowledge the unity and spirituality of the Divine Nature (as did all the Jewish sects), it is not sufficient to constitute the crime of Blasphemy, that a man's opinions be, in their consequences, derogatory from the Divine Majesty, if they be not perceived to be so by him that holds them, and broached on purpose to diminish men's veneration of God.

"The opinion of the Sadducees appears in effect to have detracted from the justice, the goodness, and even the power of the Deity, as their tendency was too manifest to diminish in men the fear of God, and consequently to

* Dr. Campbell, in his "Preliminary Dissertations."

weaken their obligations to obey him. Yet neither our Saviour, nor any of the inspired writers, call them *blasphemers*, as these opinions did not appear to them to detract, or were advanced with the intention of detracting from the honour of God. Our Lord said to the Sadducees, '*Ye err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God.*' Their adversaries, the Pharisees, though immoderately attached to their own tenets, never reproached the Sadducees as blasphemers on account of their opinions. The epithet *blasphemous*, or any synonimous term, is never coupled in Scripture with doctrines, thoughts, or opinions.

"It is only applied to words and speeches.

"A *blasphemous opinion*, or blasphemous doctrine, are phrases (which though familiar to us) are as unsuitable to the Scriptural idiom, as a *railing opinion*, or slanderous doctrine is to ours."

"But to proceed from what is *not*, to what *is*, called Blasphemy in Scripture: the first divine law published against it, '*He that blasphemeth the Lord* (or Jehovah as it is in the Hebrew) *shall be put to death,*' when considered, along with the incident that occasioned it, suggests a very atrocious offence in words, no less than abuse or imprecations, vented against the Deity. For in whatever the crime of the man there mentioned be interpreted, whether as committed against the true God, the God of Israel, or against any of the false Gods whom his Egyptian father worshipped, the law in the words just quoted is sufficiently explicit; and the circumstances of the story plainly show, that the words he had used were derogatory from the Godhead, and shocking to the hearers."

Blasphemy, like every other species of defamation, may proceed from ignorance combined with rashness and presumption; but it invariably implies an expression of contempt, or detestation, and a desire of producing the same passions in others. As this conduct, however, is more heinous in the knowing than in the ignorant, there are degrees of guilt in Blasphemy. God's name is said to be blasphemed among the heathen, through the scandalous conduct of his worshippers. And when Nathan said to David, "*By this deed thou hast given occasion to the enemies of Jehovah to blaspheme,*" his de-

sign was evidently to charge on that monarch a considerable share of the guilt of those blasphemies which his heinous transgression in the matter of Uriah would give rise among their idolatrous neighbours, for here, as in other cases, the flagrant iniquity of the servant rarely fails to bring reproach on the master, and on his service. It is a most flagitious kind of Blasphemy of which those men are guilty, who, instead of being brought to repentance by the plagues wherewith God visits them for their sins, are fired with a monstrous kind of revenge against their Maker, which they vent in vain curses and impious reproaches. Thus, in the Apocalypse, we are informed of those "*who blaspheme the God of Heaven because of their pains and their sores, and repented not of their deeds.*"

The Jews accused our Blessed Master of Blasphemy, when in curing the paralytic, he said "thy sins be forgiven thee" meaning *thy disease shall leave thee*. Had the Jews accused him of arrogance in the attempt to command disease to flee at his bidding, the term would have been more appropriate. Jesus, however, to show that it was arrogance, that he did not pretend to exercise a power which had not been delegated to him, asked whether it was easier to command by a word the removal of disease, or to say to the helpless paralytic, take up thy bed and walk, but that ye may know that the Son of Man *really* possesses this power, he said to the sick of the palsy "Rise, take up thy bed and walk."

In the New Testament, the word Blasphemy is used to denote vile and calumnious speeches, whether uttered against God or man. The Apostles were evil spoken of, or *blasphemed*. If our orthodox brethren, whose mouths are filled with *holy cursings* and pious denunciations against Unitarians, would endeavour to gain better and more correct information respecting the religious sentiments of Unitarians, they would not vent their *Godly* slanders against a people who are equal in the sight of Him who knowest the inmost secrets of the hearts of his creatures.

A FEW WORDS ABOUT WAR.

BY JAMES HENRY, M.D., DUBLIN.

Two islands lying near each other in the Atlantic Ocean, were at a remote period of time inhabited by a people who professed and believed the Christian religion. This people were taught and commanded by their pure and holy Faith, to love their enemies, to forgive injuries, to recompense good for evil, to live peaceably with all men; and to take it for their rule of conduct always to do unto others as they would that others should do unto them. Such was the ordinance and command of their Lord, Christ Jesus, delivered to his disciples in the most earnest, affectionate, and authoritative manner; and with the awful warning, that if they did not forgive those who trespassed against them, neither would their Heavenly Father forgive them their own trespasses.

Now the people of these two islands observed this command of their Divine Master in the following manner.

They kept an armed force by sea and land, consisting of nearly two hundred thousand fighting men, whom they sent to the north, and to the south, and to the east, and to the west, to kill, and to burn, and to destroy. And some of these men were on foot, and shot and stabbed with guns and bayonets; and others of them were on horseback, and had lances in their rests, and swords by their sides, and pistols at their saddle-bows; and if any persons escaped and fled from the foot soldiers, the horsemen galloped after them, and trampled them under their horses' hoofs, and cut them to pieces with their swords, and shot them with their pistols. And those who sent out these armed men were called Christians, disciples of the meek and merciful Jesus; and the armed men themselves were called Christians; and many of those whom they killed and destroyed were their brethren in Christ.

And the people of those islands had great guns which they called cannon, and they armed large ships with them, and sent them to America, and to Egypt, and to Syria, and to India, and to Arabia, and to China, and to Turkey, and to France, and to Spain, and to Portugal; and they anchored them off the maritime towns of those countries, and discharged the cannon against the walls and the houses, until they battered them down. And some of

the balls from the cannon were red hot, and set fire to the houses into which they fell; and others of the balls were hollow, and filled inside with smaller balls, and gunpowder, and iron spikes, and these exploded where they fell, and killed and destroyed all around.

And by these means great multitudes of men, women, and children were killed; and many were wounded and maimed for life; and many died miserably of their wounds, after long continued suffering; and many men were taken prisoners, and carried into captivity far from their native land; and many women were made widows, and children orphans; and numbers who escaped with their lives and liberty, lost all their property, and were driven to wander about the world, not knowing where to lay their heads, and mourning for their slaughtered friends and relatives.

And when the news of these exploits arrived in those islands, there were great rejoicings among all the people, and they forgot the sufferings, and wounds, and deaths of their own soldiers, or considered them as of no account, so great was their joy for the injury which they had inflicted upon others. And in their joy they illuminated their houses, and had grand reviews and mock fights. And those persons whose occupations kept them at home, and prevented them from going with the armies, and taking part in, or witnessing the actual slaughter, delighted to see these reviews and mock fights; and men, women, and children went to see them, and took pleasure in hearing the firing of the musketry and of the cannon, and in seeing the flashing of the swords, and the charging of the cavalry, and some flying and some pursuing, and others lying for dead, as if it were a real battle.

And it was the duty of the chief governor of those islands to take care that all the soldiers and their captains were always ready prepared to shed blood, and to burn and destroy at a moment's notice; and that their powder was always dry, and their arms shining and bright, and all their equipments perfect. And all the soldiers and their captains were rewarded according to the number of men, women, and children whom they had killed, and of the towns which they had battered down and burnt, and the extent of country which they had pillaged. And one portion of the property which they had carried off

was divided among them, and called prize-money; and the other portion was put into the public treasury.

And the captains who had killed and destroyed most received the greatest honour, and all the people flocked to see them; and estates, and titles, and decorations were heaped upon them; and pillars and testimonials were erected to them in the most public places; and monuments and trophies in the houses where the people of those islands used to meet, for the purpose of praying to the meek and lowly Jesus, whose command was "Love your enemies."

And when the captains and the soldiers returned home, they went with all the people into these houses of prayer, and sang "Not unto us, O Lord, but unto thee be the glory of all that we have slain, and all that we have destroyed;" and then they fell down on their knees, with their swords by their sides, and the banners which they had taken from the enemy waving over their heads, and prayed, saying, "Thou Lord of peace and love, who forbiddest the shedding of blood, be merciful unto us, even as we are merciful unto others." And when they had done singing and praying, they came out, and made ready to fight, and to burn, and to kill, and to destroy, as before.

And the people of those islands were generally successful in their warlike enterprises, and defeated their enemies with great slaughter; but sometimes they met a reverse, and were themselves defeated, and their soldiers and their captains slain or taken prisoner by the enemy. And then, when the news of the disaster reached home, all the people were filled with indignation, and some of them cried out, "Let us send more soldiers, and take vengeance upon the enemy." And some cried, "Let us send more soldiers, and redeem our honour and dignity:" and others cried, "Let us send more soldiers or what will become of our trade and commerce?" And they did so, and fought, and killed, and burned, and destroyed again, and took vengeance upon the enemy; and redeemed their honour and dignity, and extended their trade and commerce.

And the captains of the soldiers were so honoured by all the people of those islands, that more persons desired to be captains than could be appointed; and there arose a rivalry among them, and they contended who should be

appointed captain. So a rule was made, that the appointment to be a captain should be sold at a high price; and then the richest men began to buy the appointment for their sons, and bestow it on them as a means by which they might maintain themselves and their families in wealth and honor. And to prepare them for this appointment, they sent them to colleges and schools, where the art of fighting and killing, and of sinking ships, and of storming and burning towns was taught as a science. And when the young men had become proficients in the art, and their fathers had paid the stipulated price, they were appointed captains, and ever afterwards lived by fighting and killing, respected and honoured by every one.

And sometimes it happened that the same father would rear up one of his sons to be a captain, and to live by shedding blood, and another of his sons to be a minister of the Gospel of Christ, and to preach peace and good-will to all men. And sometimes you might see the two brothers walking in the streets together, arm in arm, or going in the same carriage to the courts and levees of the chief governor of those islands; the one dressed plainly as became a minister of the Gospel, and the other in a splendid suit of scarlet or purple cloth, embroidered with gold, and a sword by his side, and martial plumes upon his head. And sometimes it happened, that if their father was a man of sufficient rank and consequence, the chief governor appointed one of his brothers to be his *aide-de-camp* and attendant in all his affairs of war and injury to his neighbour, and the other to be his chaplain and attendant in all his spiritual affairs, and to preach and explain to him the Gospel of Christ.

But the private soldiers were compelled to obey their captains in all things, and to undergo fatigue and hardships of every kind, and were never promoted beyond the ranks, or made captains; no matter how many men they had killed and destroyed, or how well and bravely they had obeyed orders. So, very few desired to be private soldiers. And when the people of those islands found that very few, even of the poorest sort, desired to be private soldiers, they tempted them with large bribes; and when they were not able even by large bribes to prevail upon as many as they wished to become private soldiers, they kidnapped them, and carried them away by force from

their houses and families, and put them on board their ships, and compelled them to work them, and to fire the guns, and to kill, burn, and destroy at the command of the captains. And if any of them murmured, they flogged them with whipcord upon the bare back, until they stripped the flesh off their bones, so that many of them fainted away with agony, and some of them died. And if any of them attempted to return home to their country and families, they followed and seized them, and making them kneel down upon their coffins, shot them dead; and when they had done so, they prayed to the Lord Jesus to forgive them their trespasses, as they forgave those that trespassed against them.

And it required great sums of money to pay the salaries of the captains and the wages of the soldiers, and to purchase equipments and arms and ammunition, and to build ships of war; so they levied taxes for the purpose; and when all the taxes were not sufficient to meet the expense, they borrowed sums of money so vast that they could never be repaid, and the interest of which remained a burthen upon their own industry, and that of their children, and their children's children for ever. So the people of those islands, by means of their ships of war and their captains and their soldiers, extended their dominion and power to every part of the world, and their name became a terror to all nations, and their rich men became the richest on the face of the earth.

And the people of those islands sent out missionaries to convert the Heathen, and to teach them the pure and holy religion of the Lord Jesus; but the Heathen said, "Who are ye that come to teach us, and that practise not yourselves that which ye teach? Behold ye make war, and ye lust for conquest and power and dominion, and your name is a proverb and a byeword among all nations for love of gold, so that even the Heathen mock you." And they closed their ears, and turned away, and said one to another, "If the God which these men preach to us were a true God, they would keep his commandments."

Thus did the people of those islands crucify their Lord afresh, and put a snare and a stumbling block in the way of the Heathen.

THE CHARACTER OF THE APOSTLE PAUL.

It will be remembered by all who have read the Scriptures with attention, that the rewards which Jesus promised to his immediate disciples were annexed to futurity, and that he warned them that in this life they would have to endure privations and persecutions; that a time was approaching when the men that should kill them, would think they did God service. This prediction was strikingly verified in the conduct of Paul before he became an Apostle. It was an honest, though at the same time an intemperate, and therefore a blameable zeal for the religion in which he had been educated, that impelled him to persecute the disciples of Jesus. And as a change of sentiment does not alter the natural temperament of the man, it is not surprising that we find the same zeal manifested after his conversion; for as soon as he was made fully to comprehend that benign system which it was the object of the mission of Jesus to make known, no man could labour more ardently and effectually for its dissemination. Paul possessed a most undaunted courage, combined with a most persevering industry; and his defences at his trials, as well as his various writings, might be cited as proofs of his talents and learning. With such endowments as these, it would be next to impossible for any man to remain in obscurity. Accordingly, we find him at one time the chief instigator and actor in a violent persecution, and by and by he is pointed out as a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes, the very people he had before opposed and persecuted with so much inveteracy, so that in whatever circumstances he might have been placed, it appears quite evident that Providence had not designed him to act an inferior part.

Paul was the Apostle of the Gentiles, and the ease with which he appears to have divested himself of his national prejudices, and the alacrity with which he undertook the important work of proselyting his countrymen, afford considerable proofs of the benevolence of his disposition; and his uncompromising integrity was perhaps never more clearly evinced than by his reproval of Peter at Antioch for withdrawing himself from the society of the Gentile converts, out of deference to the prejudices

of those of his own nation; and but for the firm and upright conduct of Paul, the Gentiles might have been trammeled with those ritual observances which the elder of the Apostles (Peter) had declared to be a yoke that neither their fathers nor they were able to bear. The thought of having been at one time opposed to the religion of Jesus, constantly recurred to the mind of Paul, and operated as a powerful stimulus to his exertions in the furtherance of that cause of which he had now become the most able and strenuous advocate. To this one object all the energies of his powerful mind were directed to accomplish this great enterprise—to atone for the wrong that he had done, and to render himself worthy of the high reward, he thought no difficulty or danger too great to encounter, and no labour or suffering too much to endure.

Such was the man of energetic mind,
Wise, bold, enduring, and of purpose firm,
Whom Jesus to the mighty labour called,
More than Herculean!
To rouse the prostrate intellect of Man—
Teach him his worth, emancipate his mind
From priestly thraldom, and unhallowed rites,
To scorn the Idol Gods he once adored,
Their temples, and their altars to desert;
And worship ONE, the living and the true.

WILLIAM CAITLIN.

THE PRIMROSE.

THANK GOD! though we be prone to grieve,
Small things can bring us joy;
And holy feelings planted deep,
Though change or care may bid them sleep,
No time can e'er destroy.

Dear friend! thy thought was but to give
This pale and scented flower,
Some token of the spring to show;
Thou gavest me more than thou canst know—
A charm of wondrous power!

My lips are trembling now with prayer,
My eyes are full of tears;

The blessed thoughts that once were mine
Come back with this small gift of thine,
Pure as in childhood's years.

Again I wander as of old,
Or watch the calm spring sky,
Though roofing boughs look down on me,
Kneeling beneath some tented tree,
When none but GOD is nigh.

A whisper runs along the grass,
A tremor of delight;
The tasselled hazel to and fro
Is waving round me as I go;
And now the river, singing low,
Has flashed upon my sight.

Again I feel my heart o'erflow
With charity and love,
And know that earth is linked with heaven,
Since to her flowers is beauty given,
Like the sweet stars above.

Again my mother's whispers fall
Upon mine eager ear;
Sweet words of counsel or of praise,
Returning from those long past days
In echoes soft, yet clear.

Thank GOD, who gives to lowly things
Such sweet, resistless power!
I feel that highest, holiest thought,
To new existence may be brought
By ministry unknown, unsought,
Of one pale simple flower!

SELECTIONS.

FUTURE LIFE.—Is there any need of a stronger light on the subject of our future existence than that given to us by one of our own race, having died and risen again from His grave, and who, after His sleep, had exhibited Himself in the dark tabernacle of mankind as identically the same, with precisely the same disposition, the same friendship—bearing in His faithful memory the smallest as well as the greatest events of His earthly existence? What a clear—what a cheering light has not this kindled around

the dark gates of the tomb! It has united the two worlds; it has thrown a bridge over the dark abyss; it enables the otherwise timorous pilgrim to approach it without horror, and friends to say "good night" to each other with the same composure, on the evening of life, as on the evening of a day.—*F. Reimer.*

Local Traditions in Palestine.—A less questionable source of information is found in the traditions of the peasantry, in local recollections, and in long-established usages. Here human nature comes into play, in a less perverted form than when it is under the influence of monkish credulity, or ecclesiastical selfishness. The native traditions of a country—those that spring up spontaneously on the spot to which each refers, and pass from father to son, through successive generations, as family heirlooms —may, indeed, gather moss and rubbish, as they proceed, but are generally found to have a large substratum of pure, unquestionable truth. Yet even these are, in no case, to be received without scrutiny, or in opposition to good counter evidence. We give an example:—The traditions of the country have fixed the burial-place of Moses on the summit of one of the highest mountains which lie, in a north-westerly direction, about two hours from the Dead Sea. On this spot there is certainly a tomb built, in the usual Mohammedan style. Jews and Mohammedans evidence their belief in the truth of this tradition by reverentially offering up their prayers with their faces bent towards it. Yet it is from the precise spot where the tomb is most conspicuous that a commanding view is obtained of the majestic mountains of Moab, east of Jordan, and, among them, of Nebo, "over against Jericho," where the great lawgiver died. Besides, it was not on a mountain, but "in a valley, in the land of Moab, over against Bethpeor," that the Jewish legislator was interred; and the sacred record expressly adds—"No man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day" (Deut. xxxii. 50; xxxiv. 6).—*People's Dictionary of the Bible.*

INTELLIGENCE.

PEACE MEETING AT BOSTON.

In consequence of a numerously signed memorial to the Mayor of Boston, requesting him to convene a public meeting to consider the contemplated enrolment of the militia, one of the largest and most animated meetings ever held in the ancient Guildhall, took place on Monday evening, January 26th. Mr. John Noble, town councillor, occupied the chair, and all the dissenting ministers of the town, with the exception of the Wesleyan Methodists, were either present, or signified their approbation of the purposes of the meeting. The first resolution was moved by the Rev. T. W. Mathews, General Baptist Minister, and seconded by Mr. Bailey:—

Resolved, that this meeting having observed with thankfulness the peace which has so long subsisted, both at home and abroad, feel most

unwilling to countenance any measure calculated to promote a return of the manifold evils of war.

The mover of this resolution dwelt at large upon the blessings of peace and the evils of war, and with powerful effect reviewed *seriatim* and exposed to merited indignation and scorn, the various pretences under which war is defended and encouraged. The second resolution, which was moved by the Rev. James Malcolm, Unitarian Minister, and seconded by the Rev. J. Taylor, New Connexion Methodist, was:—

That this meeting regard with grief and surprise the announcement of an intention on the part of Government to enrol the militia, considering such a measure as oppressive, especially to the poor, and as tending to the degradation and retrogression of human society

Mr. Malcolm, after commenting upon the false ideas that were still so prevalent in society with respect to the real nature of the war system, entered at considerable length into a proof of the propositions contained in the resolution. Whether the contemplated calling out of the militia be the best preventive of war, as some contend, he was not prepared to determine, although *preparing* thus for war, seemed not to him the *best* way of coming to an amicable settlement; but what he feared and denounced, was the engendering of a *war spirit*, by thus dragging people from their peaceful occupations, and giving them a taste for the more exciting duties of a military life. The speaker then showed the desperate and ruinous nature of this most delusive game, in its oppression—its expenditure of blood and treasure: in the degradation, both mental and moral, of a military life and education, and in the baneful effects of war upon the progress of civilization; and concluded by showing that if no other good effect resulted from their present meeting than the spreading abroad throughout society a more healthy tone of feeling on this subject, their labour would not be in vain. The Rev. B. Farrington, Calvinistic Baptist, moved the third resolution, viz.:—

That the raising of the militia is at this time peculiarly uncalled for, because of the large standing army at present existing—because of the jealousy it would provoke in other nations, and because the people of this country manifest a general aversion both from foreign war and domestic disturbance.

Thomas Small, Esq., surgeon, in seconding this motion, ridiculed, in a happy vein of satire, the system of war, and the irrational mode of settling disputes by means of the strong arm. The utmost unanimity and enthusiasm prevailed throughout the vast meeting; and although discussion or even controversy was invited by the Chairman, not a voice or a hand spoke or moved in opposition to the various resolutions. A petition to Parliament was afterwards adopted by acclamation, and numerously signed. During the progress of the meeting, Mr. Mathews read the following excellent Address to the Inhabitants of Boston in America, which was adopted by the meeting, signed by the Chairman, and will be forwarded to Boston forthwith:—

Esteemed Citizens of Boston in New England—

We, the inhabitants of Boston in Old England, assembled at a public

meeting, convened by our Mayor, in the Town Hall, Jan. 26th, 1846, beg leave respectfully to present to you this friendly address on the subject of international peace. Two centuries ago, the inhabitants of your city, because they had received from this place the persecuted but truly venerable minister of the gospel, Mr. John Cotton, honoured our town by changing the name of their town, and adopting that of Boston. We trust that the respect then showed will always continue to be deserved; and that friendship along with commercial intercourse will for all generations be perpetuated, never to be interrupted by national jealousies, or by the horrors and crimes of war. We believe war to be an evil—a pure evil, unattended by any good in its motives, actions, and results; an evil so tremendous, that no earthly consideration can justify it. We are convinced that war is destructive to all the interests of humanity—to happiness and liberty, to commerce and wealth—to science, arts, and civilization, to learning and intelligence, to philanthropy and religion. We regard war as unreasonable; for even should it prove which party had the most strength, it would never show on which side was the most *right.* And we doubt not that any good which may in some cases be supposed to have resulted from fighting, could have been secured in a greater degree, more rapidly, more effectually, more widely, more permanently, and far more cheaply, by negociation.

We observe that any Government designing an attack on the rights, liberty, happiness, and commercial prosperity of any other nation, in all cases commences by assailing the rights, liberty, property, happiness, and commerce of its own people. We consider war to be condemned alike by the voice of conscience and experience; by natural and revealed religion; and to be unworthy of the nature of man, and contrary to the will of God. We, therefore, protest against our being called upon to fight, either against you or any other portion of the one family of man. We hope to see the day when it will be proved that war is as needless as it is pernicious; that it may be avoided; that the friends of reason and religion are able to awaken such a public sentiment on the subject, as will render it impossible for the proud, the selfish, and the ambitious, to turn the hand of man against his brother. Citizens of Boston, permit us to exhort you to cherish and to spread these pacific principles, till all nations shall repose amid the blessings of an universal and perpetual peace.

Signed by order of the Meeting,
JOHN NOBLE, Chairman.
BENJ. FARRINGTON, Secretary.

RONGE.

We present our readers with the following extract from a letter addressed to the editor of a contemporary, connected with continental affairs, relating to this extraordinary man; his mind appears to be making rapid progress towards more liberal views of the religion of Jesus. We regret to say that our worst fears respecting this bold and ardent young man receive daily confirmation. In a letter from a clergyman, dated Offenbach, December 1st., 1846, the writer says, speaking of Rongé, "He declared before 1,500 auditors (I heard it myself) that there are

many miracles related in the Scripture quite unworthy of God. * * * * That to behold in Christ more than man is absurd; and that the deceit of Priests alone has attributed to him divinity. The spirit of the nineteenth century, however, must destroy this cheat."

In confirmation of the above we find a report was current at Vienna on the 12th, that the Austrian Government had resolved upon energetic measures against the propagation of the new religion established by this Abbé, but no particular fact is mentioned to corroborate the report.

RELIGIOUS PARTIES IN THE UNITED STATES.

NAMES.	CHURCHES	MINISTERS	COMMUNICANTS
Roman Catholics ..	675	769	1,071,800
Protestant Episcopalians ..	1,232	1,236	72,099
Presbyterians, Old School ..	2,156	1,523	166,487
Presbyterians, New School ..	1,494	1,263	120,645
Cumberland Presbyterians ..	570	300	60,000
Other classes of ditto ..	530	293	45,300
Dutch Reformed	279	271	31,214
German Reformed	750	191	75,000
Evangelical Lutherans ..	1,232	501	146,300
Moravians	22	24	6,000
Methodist Episcopal ..	—	12,445	1,157.249
Methodist Protestant Church	—	1,300	60,000
Reformed Methodists ..	—	75	3,000
Wesleyan Methodists ..	600	500	20,000
German do. (United Brethren)	1,800	500	15,000
Alloright do. (Evangel. Associa.)	600	250	15,000
Mennonites	400	250	58,000
Orthodox Congregationalists	1,420	1,275	202,250
UNITARIAN DO.	300	250	30,000
Universalists	576	500	60,000
Swedenborgians	42	30	5,003
Regular Baptists	9,479	5,297	719,975
Six Principle do.	17	22	3,050
Seventh Day do.	60	52	6,002
Free Will do.	1,165	771	61,370
Church of God do. ..	125	83	10,000
Reformed do. (Campbell) ..	2 500	1,750	2,000,000
CHRISTIAN DO. (UNITARIANS)	650	782	39,600
Total ..	27,074	32,563	4,456,544

From this it appears, that the whole number of regular communicants is about one-fifth of the population of the United States. If we put down the cost of erecting all these churches at between 5,000 and 10,000 dollars each, the gross amount paid

out for that purpose will be 305,555,000. The gross amount of money expended in religious worship will then appear to be as follows:—

	DOLLARS.
Salaries of 32,563 ministers, at 500 dollars each	16,281,500
Interest, at six per cent., on the cost of the churches	18,333,300
Total	34,614,800

Thus we see, that the religious worship of one-fifth part of the population of this country costs annually the immense sum of 34,614,800 dollars, being a greater amount than is required for the expenses of the Government in all its branches, to which may be added several millions more, paid in supporting and holding missions abroad. We understand, that the progress of the Catholics within the last ten years has been very rapid, and greater in proportion than the Protestants. In 1834, their houses of worship numbered 272, while in 1845 the number increased to 675, with over 1,000,000 communicants. The Catholics are generally confined to the cities and small towns; the Baptists are scattered principally over the west and south-west; and the Episcopalians are strongest at the east.—*New York Herald.*

TEMPERANCE TEA PARTY.

The half-yearly Tea Meeting of the Taunton Temperance Society took place on Friday, the 23d Jan., in the Temperance Hall. The audience, which numbered upwards of two hundred, was one of the most respectable we have ever seen at these Tee-total *soirées*, and consisted of persons of every religious denomination. Amongst those present we observed the Rev. R. M. Montgomery, B.A., Rev. J. Fanning, W. Beadon, Esq., Capt. Hornbrook, Rev. Mr. Holman, and Messrs. Brannan, Cook, Lovell, S. Curry, T. Horsey, &c.

The room was gaily decorated with evergreens, laurel, &c. A chastely-executed painting by a lady, which represented, in contrast, the life of a Drunkard and that of a Teetotaller, received, and well merited, the encomiums of all who had the opportunity of viewing it.

On the motion of Mr. Brannan, the Rev. Mr. Fanning, Catholic Priest, was called to the chair—a position which he sustained with great credit to himself and satisfaction to the meeting.

The Chairman, in opening the meeting, said if ever in the course of his life he felt a moment of unalloyed pleasure, it was in meeting that assembly. The cause which they had assembled to promote was one of pure humanity; its principles could enter into no selfish feeling—could be the slaves of no unworthy interest. (Applause.) At this festive season of the year, when kind wishes and kind words were so frequently uttered, he would not omit wishing those before him many happy returns of the

day, and might each return find them increasing in happiness, increasing in good works, and increasing in the promotion of just and righteous principles. (Much applause.)

The Rev. Mr. MONTGOMERY was received with general manifestations of pleasure; when the applause had subsided, he said, he should have been glad if those who had not lately spoken at their meetings had supplied his place that evening; yet he must be allowed to say that he felt a pleasure in supporting a cause which not only did good to themselves, but to others. The purpose for which they had assembled that evening was (to use an expression in one of their Teetotal hymns) "for the purpose of doing good." And could there be a more profitable employment —one invested with higher motives and virtuous principles than this? They were met that evening to root up a moral evil, which clung to their social system, and which, like the Upas tree, spread its wide branches over the land, desolating and destroying human happiness, and investing God's creatures with untold misery and crime. (Hear, hear.) After some further remarks the speaker said, "Intemperance leads to crime; it gives scope to every evil desire, it destroys every moral principle: it breaks down the intellect, and turns the man upon society, hardened in every vice, deaf to all remonstrance, careless of all consequences." If they looked at passing events, how often did they read of the revengeful feelings excited by drunkenness, and how Englishmen, under the maddening influence of drink, had, like the Italian or Spaniard, stabbed and murdered when intoxicated. After reading the sentiments of the late Lord Bacon, Sir Matthew Hale, the present Mr. Baron Alderson, Mr. Justice Coleridge, and Mr. Poynder, a gentlemen who had spent many years in India—and all of whom had described the crime of drunkenness as productive of every misery and the social bane of existence—Mr. Montgomery remarked, that the drinking evils of this country could be put an end to, if the people would be but in earnest. Already the movements which the society were putting forward were encouraged by many of those who were not enrolled in their ranks. (Applause.) As intelligence advanced, the working man especially would see that intoxicating drinks took a sum from his earnings, more than he could spare. If he spent 4d. a-day in beer, that would amount at the end of the year to £6 1s. 8d., and who would deny that the money could not be applied to better uses? (Applause.) The following articles of clothing could be purchased from the mere abandonment of this needless liquor:—

LOSS.	£	s.	d.
One quart of beer a-day, at 4d. a quart, comes in a year to	6	1	8
MEN'S CLOTHING.			
A hat	0	6	0
A fustian coat	0	16	0
A waistcoat	0	6	0
A pair of fustian trousers	0	7	6
A cotton shirt, 4 yards, at 8d.	0	2	8

	£	s.	d.
A neckerchief	0	0	7
A pair of knitted stockings	0	1	4
A pair of youth's ditto	0	1	0
A pair of high shoes	0	14	0
A pair of boy's shoes	0	8	6
WOMEN'S CLOTHING.			
A straw bonnet	0	3	0
A cloth cloak	0	10	0
A shawl handkerchief	0	1	0
A cotton gown, 7½ yards, at 6d.	0	3	9
A stuff petticoat, 5 yards, at 8d. ..	0	3	4
A flannel petticoat, 2¼ yards, at 9d. ..	0	1	8
A shift, 3 yards, at 5d.	0	1	3
A pair of stockings	0	1	0
A pair of shoes	0	7	10
A pair of girl's shoes	0	5	6
FOR THE HOUSE.			
A pair of Scotch sheets, 10 yards, at 7½d. ..	0	6	3
A pair of 8-4 blankets	0	9	0
A coverlid	0	4	6
Total	£6	1	8

Intemperance led a man to the Union Workhouse, and when he got there, who would help him out? If they looked into the habitations of the destitute, (and their worthy friend, Mr. Cook, could bear him out), they would find that Intemperance had been at work. The vast sums which were spent in intoxicating liquors were enormous. In 1834, in the large manufacturing town of Sheffield, nearly £40,000 was spent alone in beer. The number of houses open for the sale of beer that year was 749, and how many shops for the sale of necessary articles of food did they think were then open?—759—a difference of 10 only. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Allison, a gentleman of high standing, and who had written on the subject of the Poor-law, stated in reference to Glasgow, a few years since, that he had made a careful calculation, and the amount spent in that city in the sale of liquor during the year, to which he referred, was about one million two hundred thousand pounds, of which one million was spent by the working men alone. (Hear, hear.) With what grace could the working men demand the removal of taxation, when they, instead of making the best use of their wages, were thus impoverishing themselves? Mr. Montgomery then referred to the manufacturing town of Kidderminster, and remarked that there, the evils of Intemperance were openly seen amongst the artisans; he had been informed by a friend residing in that town that many of the workmen, instead of spending the week in profitable labour, would work only three days, for which, if clever, they might earn from £2 to £3 each, the remainder of the week, including Sunday, being spent in the public house. Mr. Kenrick, an extensive manufacturer at Varteg, and also a Teetotaller, had

taken the pains to inquire into the state of things in that town, and he found, on close inquiry, that out of a population of 17,000 there were 1,962 drunkards. It cost this country every year no less a sum than fifty millions per annum for intoxicating liquors. What was the interest of the national debt, compared to this?—(Hear.) Poor-rates were high, and they were so, simply because of the expenses entailed by drunkenness. A gentleman, to whom he (Mr. M.) was speaking the other day, had remarked, in reference to a Benefit Club, that he was anxious to make it available to working men, because he knew that the temperate habits inculcated in the rules of the society, would reduce the amount of the poor-rates very considerably. He (the speaker) would be glad to know the amount of taxation which could be reduced, if our population were a sober one. (Hear, hear.) Referring to the condition of Ireland, he proved, by well-attested facts and figures, that the temperance reformation in that country had lessened crime, and broken down in many instances the vindictive feelings of rival factions. Mr. Montgomery concluded his address as follows:—The temperance reformation is one which is throwing its healing influences upon society; it is one which is merging mankind into the circle of one generous and holy feeling; it is assisting the regeneration of the human race in its onward struggles; it is emancipating the slave of unholy indulgence from his thraldom, and pointing to nobler objects, and while assisting the moral elevation of the human being, the spiritual is not lost sight of. The work is one for which many ardent minds are toiling—the work is one which Providence has blessed, and which is everywhere reaping abundant fruit. (Great applause.)

The CHAIRMAN said the lady whose talent had been shown in the painting hung behind him, had also favoured them with some temperance verses, which he was sure all would be pleased to hear sung. He was glad to find that two such noble arts had been enlisted in the service of the Taunton Temperance Society. (Applause.)

The piece was excellently sung by Messrs. Brannan, Hancock, and Mosse.

Mr. Montgomery then left the hall.

The CHAIRMAN said, a gentleman now having taken his departure (Mr. Montgomery), he felt he could betray the little secret to which he had adverted. The beautiful painting and the exquisite verses were the production of Mrs. Montgomery. (Applause.) He felt grateful, as he was sure all did, for her kindness, and he was confident it would not be asking too much if he asked the meeting to give that lady a vote of thanks. (A voice, "and three cheers, too.") Well, they might wind up with that, but let them first set the other a-going.

The vote was warmly responded to, and the cheers were given with a strong ebullition of feeling.

A piece of music was then sung, after which

The CHAIRMAN said the business of the meeting was about to conclude; he thanked those present for the order and good feel-

ing which had been manifested throughout the evening. He trusted the speeches which had been delivered would tend to create a spirit of inquiry amongst those who were not at present enrolled in their society, and that they would ere long see the necessity of joining them for the purpose of eradicating the worst social evil of the day. (Applause.)

[By the kindness of the Authoress, we have been favoured with a copy of the verses referred to, and with much pleasure subjoin them for the gratification of our readers.—Ed. Unitarian.]

Oh ! thou who heard'st thy children's prayer,
When bending low in deep despair,
  They raised the bitter cry
For water in that desert land—
For water in that burning sand,
  To quench their agony.

Then forth the glittering torrent rush'd,
And ev'ry murmuring tongue was hush'd,
  And brightly gleamed each eye ;
The burning brow that throbbed with pain,
The quiv'ring lip grew calm again,
  And breathed the grateful sigh.

And shall we in this happy land,
Where crystal streams on ev'ry hand,
  A beverage pure supply—
Shall we our Maker's gift despise,
Rejecting what the Jews did prize,
  And *poison* take and die.

PRESENTATION TO DR. DRUMMOND OF HIS PORTRAIT.

On Friday, January 30th, the subscribers to the portrait assembled in the meeting-house, Great Strand-street, Dublin, at three o'clock. The chair was taken by J. Moody, Esq., barrister-at-law. The address was read by J. C. Ferguson, Esq., M.D., immediately after which Dr. Drummond delivered his reply, thanking his friends for their kind testimonial, which he accepted with pride and gratitude. To himself he considered the portrait of little value ; but as a testimonial of their approbation of the religious tenets of which he was the humble advocate, and in connection with those who are endeared to him by the most tender and endearing relations, it is of the highest—his children, whose excellent disposition is leading them in a path in which he hoped they would continue to progress as long as they lived, and will learn to prize it as a memorial of their kindness, when he whom it represents shall be seen no more. It may serve as a memento to "keep the instruction of their father, and forsake not the law of their mother." After Dr. Drummond had delivered his reply, Dr. Antisell, the secretary, said he was requested by the committee to present the Rev. G. Armstrong, as colleague of Dr. D, with a handsomely framed lithograph of the portrait ; Mr. Armstrong expressed his thanks to the committee, and spoke in friendly

terms of his colleague Dr. Drummond. In the evening there was a *soirée* in the Northumberland Buildings; at eight o'clock about eighty persons sat down to tea. Dr. Drummond, his family, and several other ministers attended. After tea the chair was taken by Daniel Hulton, Esq. (President of the Irish Unitarian Society); the meeting was addressed by John Mitchell, Esq., John Armstrong, Esq., and R. Dowden, Esq., (late Mayor of Cork) who spoke to the sentiment of Dr. Drummond their guest. The Doctor replied, and the other sentiments were proposed and spoken to by Mr. James Haughton, Dr. Antisell, and the Rev. Dr. Ledlie, and Mr. Bell. Mr. Hulton having left the chair, on the motion of Dr. Antisell, seconded by Mr. Classon, jun., Mr. Haughton was moved to the chair. A vote of thanks was then given to the former chairman. The meeting separated at eleven o'clock highly gratified with their evening's entertainment. The portrait measured four feet in height and three and a half in breadth, and was painted by — Collier, Esq., of the Royal Hibernian Academy, Dublin.

REMOVALS OF MINISTERS.

The Rev. John Shannon, of Knutsford, having accepted the unanimous invitation of the Unitarian congregation at Hull, to become their minister, commenced his labours on the 8th Feb.

The Rev. L. Lewis, late pastor of the Unitarian chapel, Cheltenham, has accepted an invitation to become the co-pastor with the Rev. Dr. Shepherd, Gallacre, in Liverpool.

The Rev. M. Davidson, of Billinghurst, has accepted the office of pastor to the congregation of Mead-row chapel, Godalming, vacant by the resignation of the Rev. Edwin Chapman. He will commence his duties on the first Sunday in April.

MARRIAGES.

On the 25th ult., at the Unitarian Chapel, Stockton-on-Tees, by the Rev. J. M'Dowell, Mr. William Smith, to Mrs. Imeson, both of Stockton.

Feb. 3, at the Unitarian Chapel, by the Rev. W. James, Dr. William Bulphin, to Rosina, widow of Mr. William Lane, of this city.

3d ult., at Renshaw-street Chapel, Mr. James Hyndford Rawlins, Syddallt Cottage, near Wrexham, to Henrietta Lomax, youngest daughter of G. L. Cox, Esq., Spring-bank, Waltonbreck.

At the Unitarian Chapel, Gee Cross, on the 5th ult., by the Rev. James Brookes, Thomas Bayley Potter, Esq., son of the late Sir Thomas Potter, of Manchester, to Mary, daughter of Samuel Ashton, Esq., Pole-bank, near Hyde.

On the 15th ult., at the Unitarian Church, St. Peter's-square, Stockport, Mr. Joseph Bailey, to Miss Elizabeth Cocker.

A paper relating to Ragged Schools has been prepared, but is unavoidably deferred till our April number for want of space; in the mean time further and more interesting particulars will be inserted.

*** Communications for the Editor to be sent to 7, Farringdon Street, London.